RN99101

Serial Number: 10/049,575

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

It is asserted that these amendments do not add new matter and are supported by the

specification and claims as originally filed. Entry of these claims is respectfully

requested.

Claims 14-25 and 29-31 have been rejected.

Claim 14 has been amended.

Claims 17-22, 29 and 30 are kept unchanged.

Claims 15, 16, 23-25, and 31 have been canceled.

Claims 14, 17-22, 29 and 30 are pending in the application.

Claims 14-25 and 29-31 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Claims 14-25, 27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over WO

96/01245.

The claimed invention relates to a process for degreasing a hard metal surface,

comprising the step of using an aqueous medium comprising at least one compound

employed in a concentration of from 0.01 to 10 g/l, having the following formula (I):

$$Z-X-[CH(R^3)-CH(R^4)-O]_n-[CH_2CH_2-O]_P-R^5$$
 (I)

wherein:

- Z represents a group having the following formula:

8

wherein:

- X represents -CH₂-CH₂-O-,
- R³ and R⁴, which are identical or different, represent hydrogen or a methyl group, provided that at least one of groups R³ or R⁴ is other than hydrogen,
- R⁵ represents hydrogen,
 - n is an integer or a fractional number from 3 to 5 inclusive, and
 - p is an integer or a fractional number from 6 to 10, limits excluded.

The Examiner asserts that the unexpected result showed in the previous amendment was a "little better" within the claimed y range when x is 3. Applicant respectfully submits that the improvement shown is greater by far than a "little better". Indeed, examples and comparative examples show a degreasing time dramatically reduced with the claimed compounds. Degreasing time decreases of 75% for the worse comparative example, or of 33% for the best comparative example [(45-30)/45]. Improvements of 33%-75% in the instant technical field should be considered as much more than a "little better".

WO 96/01245 only teaches that the performance of a surfactant effect may be modified by manipulating the degrees of ethoxylation and propoxylation. However, a surfactant effect is clearly distinct from a degreasing effect. Thus improving the surfactant effect does not necessarily means that greasing will be improved. Greasing is a process involving much more than having a simple surfactant effect. One might have a compound having good surfactant properties with poor degreasing effects.

Therefore, the person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would not have considered

RN99101

Serial Number: 10/049,575

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

the teaching of manipulating the degrees of ethoxylation and propoxylation for

modifying surfactant properties as relevant for modifying degreasing. There is no

technical rationale for saying that improving degreasing when manipulating the

degrees of ethoxylation and propoxylation was expected in view of the reference.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now reconsider

and withdraw the rejection of claims 14-25, 27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103 (a) as obvious over WO 96/01245.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is asserted that the patent application is in

condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any question concerning these

remarks that would further advance prosecution of the claims to allowance, the

examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (609) 860-4180. A

notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

March 0, 2004

Rhodia Inc.

259 Prospect Plains Road

CN7500

Cranbury, NJ 08512

RN99101.Final amend.doc

Respectfully submitted.

Jean-Louis SEUGNET

Limited Recognition under 37 CFR §

10.9(b) enclosed.

Tel: (609) 860-4180

Fax: (609) 860-0503